An-Najah Univ. J. Res. (H. Sc.), Vol. 18(2), 2004

The Translatability of Utterances Containing Implicatures from Arabic into English

طواعية ألفاظ التعريض للترجمة من العربية الى الانجليزية

Ekrema Shehab

English Department, Faculty of Arts, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.

E-Mail: ikrimas@yahoo.com

Received: (10/12/2003), Accepted: (25/4/2004)

Abstract

This paper basically aims at investigating some major problems encountered in the translation of Arabic utterances containing implicatures (henceforth Arabic implicatures) into English, where what is meant goes well beyond what is said. The data of the study consists of 9 Arabic implicatures identified by the researcher as comprising difficulties to translators. These implicatures have been drawn from Mahfouz's (1947) novel Ziqaq Al-Midaq. Fifteen M.A. students of translation at An-Najah National University served as the subjects in this study. They were asked to provide their own translations of these Arabic implicatures in the light of their original contexts. The study also uses Trevor Le Gassick's renditions in his (1975) translation of Mahfouz's novel. For the purpose of this study, the researcher devised a framework of analysis based on Grice's (1975) theory of conversational implicature. The framework features Tautology, Irony, and Metaphor as strategies giving rise to conversational implicature. The present paper argues that, when translating Arabic implicatures into English, emphasis should be placed on conveying the pragmatic import by the employment of various strategies ranging from those capturing the form and/or function to those capturing the communicative sense independently.

ملخص

يهدف هذه البحث إلى دراسة بعض المشاكل الرئيسة التي قد تعترض المترجم عند قيامه بترجمة عبارات التعريض من العربية إلى الإنجليزية، وهي التي لا يوحي ظاهرها بمعناها الخفي. تتكون مادة البحث من تسع عبارات تعريض يرى الباحث أن فيها ما يشكل صعوبات للمترجم. وقد اختارها الباحث من رواية "زقاق المدق" (١٩٤٧) لنجيب محفوظ. وتألفت عينة الدراسة من خمسة عشر طالباً من طلبة ماجستير الترجمة في جامعة النجاح الوطنية، إذ طلب منهم ترجمة الإستبانة المؤلفة من عبارات التعريض وفقاً لمقتضى سياقاتها الأصلية. وقد ضمّن الباحث الدراسة ما يناظر ذلك من ترجمة ليجاسك (١٩٧٥) لرواية نجيب محفوظ. وقد أجرى الباحث دراسته في إطار تحليلي

يستند إلى نظرية غرايس (١٩٧٥) في التعريض الخطابي. ويتناول هذا الإطار أساليب التكرار والسخرية والاستعارة بوصفها أدوات للتعريض الخطابي. وقد بينت نتائج البحث أنه عند ترجمة عبارات التعريض من العربية إلى الإنجليزية، فإنه يجب على المترجم التركيز على نقل المعنى البراجماتي مستعيناً بوسائل شتى من نقل الشكل أو المعنى أو كليهما معاً إلى نقل المعنى بشكل مستقل.

1. Introduction

The present paper is mainly concerned with the translatability of Arabic implicatures into English. Inner meanings or implicatures constitute a problem in the translation of utterances from Arabic into English and vice versa, and the translator is faced with a double-edged problem: on the one hand; he has to identify the precise meaning intended by the originator of the utterance; on the other hand, he has to convey the accurate meaning in the Target Language (TL). An utterance may be open to several possible interpretations. This possible ambivalence of inner meanings in utterances has been troublesome for translators. In this connection, Leech (1983:81) points out that "interpreting an utterance is ultimately a matter of guess work, or hypothesis formation." Each utterance, therefore, should be considered in its immediate context of use to arrive at the precise implicature intended by the speaker. This is not always an easy task, for implicatures are usually determined by what is conveyed by an utterance rather than by what is literally expressed. By way of illustration, consider the following example from Mahfouz's (1947) "Ziqaq Al-Midaq":

"لا يجوز أن يشعر بي أحد!
فقالت ضاحكة وكأنها وثقت من امتلاكه للأبد:
أحطك في عيني وأكحل عليك!" (P.105)

"Nobody should feel my presence in here, he said. She assured him, as if she was certain of possessing him forever, with me you are very safe".

(p.108) Le Gassick's rendition

Undoubtedly, Le Gassick's translation of the above underlined utterance bears witness to the fact that he fell short of accounting for the metaphorical implicatures encapsulated in this utterance, namely the eye-love metaphor, which emanates from the use of the expression

"أحطك في عيني" (Lit: I put you in my eye.), and the prison metaphor, which arises from the use of "أكحل عليك" (Lit: I smear you with Kohl.). Thus the above utterance could be best translated as:

"You will be locked up in my heart forever".

or something like "My heart will be your stronghold forever".

In Grice's system, this example basically violates the maxim of Quality (speak the truth) and to a lesser extent; it violates the Quantity maxim since the speaker in the above extract is being underinformative.

In order to explain how people can imply more than they actually say, Grice (1975) developed a theory of conversation which consists of the Cooperative Principle (CP) and its four maxims:

1. Maxim of quality ("do not say what you believe to be false or that for which you lack adequate evidence");
2. Maxim of quantity ("make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange, and not more informative than is required");
3. Maxim of relevance; and
4. Maxim of manner ("avoid obscurity of expression and ambiguity; be brief and orderly")

According to Grice, our talk exchanges do not normally consist of disconnected remarks, but rather, they follow the (CP) in order to get meaning across. Thus, a participant in a speech event, either observes the maxims, or flouts one or more of them. To observe a maxim is simply to follow its direction and to flout a maxim is not to follow its direction. In this study we are concerned with the flouting of the maxims. Flouting a maxim, according to Grice, is salvaged by the fact that the speaker is fulfilling another maxim. Notice the successful communication in the following example:

a: What on earth has happened to the roast beef?

b: The dog is looking very happy.

In this exchange of talk, B apparently violates the maxim of relevance because his answer is not directly related to A's question. But, a deeper analysis tells us that B is being rather cooperative. Thus, A will deduce

that the roast beef has been eaten by the dog. He inferred this by using the implicature of B's reply, hence the successful communication between A and B.

2. Research Methodology

2.1. Research Design

This paper studies 9 Arabic implicatures identified by the researcher as featuring difficulties to translators of Arabic texts into English. These implicatures were drawn from Najeeb Mahfouz's (1947) novel "Ziqaq Al-Midaq", which was translated by Trevor Le Gassick (1975) into "Midaq Alley". The study was conducted by means of a translation task. The task, which included 9 underlined Arabic implicatures in their original contexts, was administered to 15 students in the M.A. translation program at An-Najah National University, Palestine. The students were asked to translate only the underlined implicatures and to take enough time to do so (see Appendix). The subjects' translations along with Le Gassick's (1975) renditions were analyzed into three categories generating conversational implicature, namely Tautology, Irony and Metaphor.

2.2. Subjects

In order to highlight the problem under discussion, a translation task was distributed among 15 M.A. students of translation. The subjects were haphazardly chosen. The researcher administered the task only to student translators who expressed their willingness to do the job. All of these students were native speakers of Arabic. They hold a B.A. degree in English Language and Literature. During their study for the M.A. degree in translation, the subjects took courses in translating Arabic texts into English, and vice versa. Therefore, all of them were expected to have a good command of both English and Arabic.

3. Analysis and Discussion

This section deals with some major problems that translators may encounter when they embark on translating Arabic utterances containing implicatures into English. In order to carry out the analysis as well as the discussion appropriately, a framework of analysis is provided. The

framework features three categories generating conversational implicature and these are: tautological implicatures, ironical implicatures and metaphorical implicatures.

3.1. Tautological Implicatures

Tautology is the saying of the same thing again in a seemingly redundant, uninformative way. In Brown and Levinson’s (1987) terms, a tautology is the search for the informative out of the uninformative. Thus, the ever-cited tautological expression “War is War” conveys what it conveys in a seemingly uninformative way. In other words, at face value, the utterance seems a needless repetition, but, deeply, it can be used to convey a significant communicative import, namely that war brings death, destruction, suffering and pain, hence the need for its tolerance is called for.

According to Grice (1975), tautologies trigger conversational implicature via violating the maxim of quantity, i.e. by violating the speaker’s obligation to be as informative as is required for the purposes of the exchange. Thus, the tautological expressions “الشجاعة هي الشجاعة” (courage is courage), “الموت هو الموت” (death is death),

“عليه العوض! عليه العوض!” (compensation be upon Him ! compensation be upon Him !), “الف رجل ورجل” (a thousand man and a man), (see Appendix) are all cases of conversational implicature arising from the speaker’s violation of the maxim of quantity as will be shown in some detail below.

In recent studies, three approaches have been addressed to account for the interpretation of tautological utterances, namely, the radical pragmatic approach, the radical semantic approach, and the non-radical approach (cf. Wierzbicka, 1987). In the radical pragmatic approach, the interpretation of tautological expressions is governed by universal principles of conversation, and those expressions “are considered uninformative by themselves, but meaningful in context” (Okamoto 1993:434). By contrast, the radical semantic approach argues that the interpretation of tautological utterances is partly conventional and language- specific. Further, this approach maintains that meaning of tautological utterances “cannot be fully predicted in terms of any universal pragmatic representation” (ibid:

435). The non-radical approach is viewed as a compromise and argues that the interpretation of tautological utterances combines both semantics and pragmatics. In support of this, Farghal (1992: 225) explains that tautological expressions have "instantaneous implicatures that are derivable only from the context of situation, and core implicatures that can be derived from semantic representations".

Miki (1996) introduces the idea of shared beliefs or knowledge as a basic criterion in accounting for the interpretation of tautological utterances. For instance, tautologies such as "الحمار حمار" (a donkey is a donkey); "الأسد أسد" (a lion is a lion) convey what they convey provided that the speaker and the addressee share certain cultural beliefs, on top of which might be that "donkey" stands for stupidity, hence a condemnation implicature arises, and "lion" stands for boldness, hence an admiration implicature is inferred. Being aware of this, the translator may transfer the implied meaning of "الحمار حمار" and "الأسد أسد" when they are said to refer to a person in a particular situation into something like "he is a stupid person" and "he is a brave person", respectively. But, if the same implicature could be obtained, resorting to a similar tautology in the target language (TL) as "a donkey is a donkey" and "a lion is a lion", respectively, it would be most welcome.

In the light of the foregoing discussion, we can argue that tautologies in general seem to fall into two types, depending on context: partially context-dependent tautologies (partial in the sense that their meanings are not entirely contingent upon the context), and completely context-dependent tautologies. The former type refers simply to tautologies which bear meanings when used in or out of context. Thus, tautologies such as "الشجاعة هي الشجاعة" (courage is courage); "الموت هو الموت" (death is death); and "القانون هو القانون" (a law is a law), are all examples of this type. Each of these tautological expressions, it should be noted, may furnish several possible interpretations, but, when they are used in context, their meanings are drastically narrowed. Thus, context in this case is seen as a narrower (of meaning). By contrast, completely context-dependent tautologies refer to tautological expressions, which bear a communicative import only when they are used in context, i.e. when they are

pragmatically determined. Thus, the context here is viewed as the bearer of meaning. By way of illustration, consider the following two tautological implicatures:

1. ***عليه العوض! عليه العوض!***

2. ***ألف رجل و رجل*** *(see Appendix for the larger context)*

The analysis of data showed that many of the respondents as well as Le Gassick (1975) rendered (1) and (2) above literally. Hence the target language (TL) message is distorted. Observe the following two renderings of (1) by some students and Le Gassick, respectively:

– *May God compensate me, may God compensate me.*

– *May God recompense him! May God recompense him!*

Obviously, such a translation does not convey the meaning intended by (1), namely that nothing good or useful is expected from the person in question, and there is no use in talking to him to stop his bad habit (homosexuality). This implicature, it should be noted, is arrived at through background knowledge about the person in question. This knowledge is obtained from the broader context in which the utterance was produced. Similarly, note the literal translation of (2) by some students and by Le Gassick, respectively:

– *A thousand man and a man*

– *A thousand and one man*

It is clear that the students as well as Le Gassick misread (2) above and, consequently, have come up with inappropriate renderings. The implicature derived from (2) is that many men would be glad or honored if they married the woman in question (see Appendix). So, (1) and (2) above can be best translated by resorting to functional equivalence which gives priority to meaning over form. Hence the translation of (1) and (2) above could be something like (1.a) and (2.a) below:

1.a. I wash my hands off you! I wash my hands off you!

2.a. Lots of men.

On the other hand, nominal tautologies such as "**الشجاعة هي الشجاعة**" and "**الموت هو الموت**" (see Appendix) can be easily translated by a

comparable tautology in the target language since they are universally recognized and used by the target language community. The renderings of all the student translators bear witness to this. All of them as well as Le Gassick (1975) came up with the same translation:"courage is courage" and "death is death", respectively. This is in fact a good translation since it conveys the implicature of the original, namely that courage remains the same regardless of the passage of time, and one should never fear death since death is an inevitable end that all creatures shall encounter.

In short, we can say that if the source language (SL) tautological expression is not available in the target language (TL), the translator should try to render the implied meaning of the tautological utterance without paying attention to the form as shown in the translation of examples (1) and (2) above. However, if the (SL) tautology exists in the (TL) and is used by the (TL) community, the translator can render the meaning by resorting to it as exhibited in the translations above of " الشجاعة هي الشجاعة" and "الموت هو الموت".

3.2. Ironical Implicatures

Irony is another strategy of triggering conversational implicature via violating the conversational maxims in general and the maxim of quality in particular (Grice 1975, Levinson 1983, Brown and Levinson 1987). Grice (1975) states that flouting the maxim of quality is a necessary and a sufficient condition for ironical interpretation. That is, what the originator of ironical utterances intends is quite the opposite of what he has literally said. Thus, for Grice, ironical utterances would conversationally implicate, rather than figuratively mean, the opposite of what they literally say. A speaker can indirectly convey his ironic sense by implicating the opposite of what is actually said. Stressing the same point, Kotthoff (2003:1387) maintains that in irony "the said represents a perspective which is combined with a counter-perspective- the intended".

Furthermore the interpretation of ironical utterances depends greatly on context as well as on various assumptions shared by the speaker and the addressee. Mateo (1995: 172) writes, "irony depends on context since it springs from the relationships of a word, expression or action with the whole text or situation". What is possibly more important is that in the case

of ironical utterances “what the speaker means is not identical with what the sentence means” (Searle 1979: 77). In other words, the speaker’s communicative import and the sentence meaning are extremely at variance. Hence, the translator is usually faced with a double interpretation (the literal and the ironic), and he has to choose between these two interpretations depending on three parameters, which collectively activate the ironic situation namely, speaker, addressee and the broader context. What complicates the task of the translator is that “the ironist does not always need to signal his intention to ironize” (ibid: 172). This is obvious in cases of implicit irony where no indicators of irony are used. However regarding explicit irony, it is highlighted by markers, such as “it is ironic that, ironically, it would be a bitter irony if, there is a certain irony” Barbe (1993: 579). Likewise, in the case of Arabic, one may come across certain expressions which may signal that an ironic interpretation rather than a literal one is called for. Some of these expressions, which are usually encountered in literary works, are: “قال ساخراً” (he said ironically); “قال باستهزاء” (he said mockingly); or “قال بتهكم” (he said sarcastically).

It goes without saying that maintaining the Irony Principle (IP) (Leech 1983) in the target language can be seen as one of the most serious problems the translator may encounter in rendering Arabic ironical utterances into English. By way of clarification, consider the following example:

طبعاً ! أميرة بنت أمراء ! *(Lit. Of course! A princess daughter of princes).*

The speaker in the above example (see Appendix) apparently fails to observe the maxim of quality, thus giving rise to conversational implicature, that is, the speaker does not intend to convey that the addressee in question is of a noble or royal family, but rather, she is implying that the addressee is of a humble origin, and therefore she has no right to boast off. By so doing, the speaker is being impolite in a seemingly polite manner. This is what Leech (1983) observes as being offensive in an apparently friendly way, i.e. being ironic. More specifically, the implicature derived from the (IP) in the above example works as follows: what the speaker says to the addressee (you are a princess) is polite and is

not true. But, what the speaker really means (the addressee is not really a princess) is impolite to addressee and true (of her). Perhaps the larger context of the novel indicates that the addressee is of a low, or humble social class. This context in itself would trigger the intended irony. The irony is also derived from the tune (intonation) of the speakers, a factor that cannot be shown in translation without using certain orthographical signals, such as quotation marks or exclamation marks or ellipsis, etc. In our analysis of the data, we found that a large number of students adopted a literal translation of the above utterance. It is true that their translation presents a reasonable meaning of the utterance, but it does not capture the ironic meaning implicated in the utterance. Le Gassick (1975), however, rendered the utterance by resorting to paraphrase, but he enclosed his translation within inverted commas in order to alert the reader that an ironic sense is intended in the original. His reasonable translation reads as follows:

“Of course you will, a princess like yourself, a daughter of royalty”.

According to Newmark (1991), it is quite preferable, when translating ironical utterances, to use inverted commas and/or an exclamation mark in order to alert the readership. In support of this, Baker (1992:230) maintains that “in English, the use of inverted commas around a word or expression in the body of a text can suggest a range of implied meanings”. Thus, the above utterance can be best translated into something like:

“Certainly! You are a princess, a daughter of princes!”

Obviously, the translation above shows that literal translation does work in rendering ironical utterances provided that the translation be enclosed within inverted commas and/or be supplemented by an exclamation mark to point out that an ironic sense is intended in the original. However, in many cases of irony, literal translation falls short of accounting for the ironic meaning present in the original. By way of illustration, consider the example below:

***رحم الله أباك** بائع الدوم بمرجوش* *(Lit. May God have mercy upon your father the seller of al-doom (a kind of wild fruit) in Marjoosh (a name of a place)).*

This utterance is a clear case where the speaker's utterance meaning and the sentence meaning are seriously at variance. The difficulty of translating the above expression lies in the fact that it can be used to implicate more than one meaning in different contexts of situation. Farghal and Borini (1997:79) maintain that this expression may be ironically uttered "upon the mention of the deceased denotatum in a conversation for the purpose of disreputing him in a polite manner". What is more, the utterance above drifts from its semantic import and acquires new pragmatic and semantic dimensions. It is used ironically to perform an illocutionary act (Searle 1979) of insulting. This being the case, translators should scrutinize the pragmatic aspects of any expression with a theistic reference in order to come up with an appropriate rendering.

The analysis of the data showed that all the student translators but one, and Le Gassick (1975) fell victim of literal translation in their renderings of the above utterance. Their literal renderings bear witness to the fact that in some ironic usages the unsaid far exceeds the said, and meanings must be derived irrespective of the linguistic surface structure of the utterance. Observe the following inappropriate literal renderings of the previous expression by some of the students and by Le Gassick :

– *May God have mercy on your father (Le Gassick).*
– *May God bless your father.*
– *May God mercy your father's soul.*

The remaining respondent, however, seemed to realize that an impolite illocution is meant by the ironic usage of the utterance, and he reflected that offence in his rendering, but without preserving the implicated ironic sense. Note his translation below:

– *God damn your poor father.*

Depending on the background knowledge throughout the total context of the utterance, one can realize that the speaker is being ironic by conveying an impolite illocutionary act (insulting) in an apparently polite way. That is, the speaker ironically reminds the addressee of her father's poor state. In addition, the ironic sense is indicated through the use of an explicit indicator (see Appendix) of ironic intention namely, "قالت ساخرة"

(she said ironically). In order to capture the message intended by the above utterance, the following functionally-equivalent translation would work:

She rejoined: "Remember your father! The door-to-door hawker".

Another example, which violates the maxim of Quality and implicates the opposite of what is said, is:

أدركوني يا هوه قبل التلف ! *(Lit.Catch me, you, before deterioration)*

In this example, the speaker (see Appendix) violates the maxim of quality since what she means is the opposite of what is being proposed. Relying on the overall context which plays an important role in the creation of irony, we can realize that the speaker (a young beautiful girl) does not hold any kind of love or admiration towards the addressee (an old man) who chases her with his eyes in an attempt to win her love. Instead, she looks down upon him, hence an ironic interpretation of the speaker's utterance arises. That is, what the speaker really means (she will never think of loving the person in question) is the opposite of what she says, namely that she is deeply in love with him. So, in order to maintain the irony present in the original, the utterance above should be rendered in a way that reflects the ironic intention intended by the speaker. In his rendering of the above expression, Le Gassick (1975) failed to reflect its ironic sense though it seemed that he was aware of the ironic meaning implicated in it. Observe his rendering below:

"You are not for me, Abbas!"

However, a sizeable number of the students succeeded in figuring out that the speaker intended an ironic sense, and consequently they provided an acceptable translation. The renderings below by two of those students bear witness to this:

Oh! Help! Before I am lost!

Oh, people! Help me before sinking in his love!

A good rendering of the above utterance could be:

"Hey everyone! Rescue me from falling in this passionate love!"

3.3. Metaphorical Implicatures

It has been argued several times that the meaning of metaphor has to be computed regardless of the linguistic surface structure of the metaphorical utterance. This of course creates situations where the translator needs to exert much effort in order to arrive at the implicature intended by the use of a metaphor in a speech situation.

Grice (1975:53) views metaphor as a strategy of generating conversational implicature via violating the maxim of quality. This violation, it should be noted, occurs when the speaker tries to convey or emphasize a certain meaning or idea in an apparently strange and striking way. In this regard, Searle (1979) says that metaphors display obvious falsehood, semantic nonsense, or violation of conversational principles of communication. Thus, translating metaphors is no doubt a difficult task, for it involves many problems to tackle.

Before embarking on the discussion of the data, it is of great importance to point out that the translation of metaphor depends mainly on the job the metaphor does in the text, that is, whether the metaphor is used creatively (absolutely necessary and indispensable) or decoratively (just to add to the beauty of the text) (cf. Broeck 1981). If the metaphor is creative, as it is often the case in a work of art, a formal equivalence is required though it sometimes renders the metaphor less natural to (TL) readers (cf. Farghal and Shorafat1996). On the other hand, if the metaphor is used decoratively as it happens sometimes in editorials, flexibility should be sought on the part of the translator in the sense that he has the option to choose between formal, functional or ideational equivalence. That is, either he translates the metaphor creatively (formally) as long as the context permits that or renders it simply by reducing it to its communicative import. To illustrate, let us investigate the rendering of the following metaphorical utterance by some of the student translators and by Le Gassick:

رقصت قلوبهم جذلاً *(Lit. their hearts danced with happiness).*

Obviously, the implicature in the above utterance is triggered off by the use of the verb "رقصت" as it flouts the quality maxim. At face value, it seems strange and nonsensical to use the verb "رقصت" in the above

utterance. Moreover, the use of “رقصت” goes against and contradicts our factual background information in the sense that dancing is an act usually performed by human beings and never, by, say, one’s internal body parts.

In terms of analysis, the data demonstrated that most of the respondents were aware of the fact that the utterance above was used metaphorically. But, a few tried to render the same metaphor present in the source utterance. Most of them went for converting the metaphor into sense. Observe the following renderings by two of the students:

They felt happy.

They were very joyful.

These renderings, it should be noted, are to some extent, acceptable provided that the metaphor above is meant to be decorative rather than creative, and the translator runs short of finding an equivalent metaphorical imagery in the (TL). But, clearly, the metaphor is creatively used, and thus we should try to keep it in our translation to reflect its peculiar qualities and maintain the same effect on the (TL) reader. Some students, however, succeeded to a certain extent in preserving the metaphorical imagery in their renderings. Below are some of their renderings which illustrate this point:

Their hearts danced happily.

Their hearts danced joyfully.

Their hearts danced out of cheerfulness.

Depending on the context, Le Gassick (1975) went for paraphrasing the metaphor in an attempt to explain the intended implicature. Consider his rendering below:

They thoroughly enjoyed witnessing such a dramatic scene.

However, a good rendering could be something like:

Their hearts danced with ecstasy.

To shed more light on this category, consider the following metaphor, which gives rise to conversational implicature:

وطنت النفس على أن تلبس لكل حالة لبوسها *(Lit. She settled the self to wear for every case an attire).*

At the literal level, this utterance seems odd since it contradicts our factual background information. In other words, one might wonder how the self can wear an attire. Hence, a metaphorical meaning and a conversational implicature arise.

Specifically, the implicature derived from the above metaphor is that the woman in question is so experienced that she can cope with every circumstance.

In our analysis, we found that all the (15) students as well as Le Gassick (1975) recognized that the utterance above is used metaphorically. Consequently, most of the sudents and Le Gassick resorted to two strategies to convey the intended meaning, namely paraphrasing and converting the metaphor into sense. Consider

The following renderings by some of the students and Le Gassick:

She had accustomed herself to be ready at all times for any eventuality, whether good or bad (Le Gassick).

She accustomed herself to coping with every case.

She managed to get along.

The above renderings, though acceptable, do not account for the metaphorical meaning of the source utterance. Since we are dealing with a literary work where metaphors are usually creatively used, our translation should preserve the metaphorical imagery, which is found in the source utterance. Thus a more appropriate rendering of the above utterance could be:

She accustomed herself to wearing an attire for every circumstance.

4. Conclusion

The present paper has investigated some major problems translators may encounter when they translate into English Arabic utterances containing implicatures.

The study has revealed that in their attempt to render Arabic implicatures, student translators, more often than not, adopted literal translation where functional or ideational rendering should be used. The study has also shown that student translators failed to identify the precise

meanings intended by the Arabic implicatures, and thus failed to convey the accurate meaning in the (TL). We have attempted to explain that Arabic implicatures should be considered in their actual context to arrive at the precise intended meaning as they are usually determined by what is conveyed or implicated rather than what is literally expressed. However, it is still necessary to note that the study has also revealed that in some cases, literal translation does work in conveying the meaning of some Arabic implicatures, thus nullifying the claim that implicatures must be always rendered functionally. This has been obvious in the rendering of some tautological and ironical utterances in the data of the present study.

With regard to tautological implicatures, I have argued that translators should pay more attention to " complete context-dependent tautologies" than " partial ones". This is due to the fact that partial tautologies can be translated, more often than not, simply by resorting to a similar tautology in the (TL). This has been exhibited through the rendering of "الشجاعة هي الشجاعة" and "الموت هو الموت" into "Courage is courage" and "Death is death", respectively. In the case of complete tautologies, translators should be aware of the fact that such tautological expressions have no serious communicative import when they are used out of context, hence the need for translators to consider their actual context of use to be able to convey their precise implicated meaning. We have seen, for example, the appropriateness of translating"ألف رجل و رجل" and " عليه العوض! عليه العوض" into "lots of men" and "I wash my hands off you! I wash my hands off you!", respectively.

As far as ironical utterances are concerned, translators should realize the fact that in the case of ironical usages, the ironist's communicative intent and the sentence meaning are always at variance. In addition, translators should make use of context, background knowledge and explicit indicators of irony, which signal ironical intentions. Translators should try to render the (SL) irony into a (TL) irony using literal translation, provided that they use inverted commas and/or exclamation marks in order to highlight the ironic meaning. This has been obvious in the rendering of "طبعاً ! أميرة بنت أمراء!" into ("certainly ! a princess, daughter of princes!"). However, if this fails, translators may resort to

conveying the implied meaning of the ironic utterance while preserving the ironic sense implicated in the original through the use of inverted commas and/or exclamation point. We have observed the successful rendering of "أد ركوني يا هوه قبل التلف" into ("Hey everyone! Rescue me from falling in this passionate love!").Moreover, with regard to multi-purpose ironic utterances (E.g., "رحم الله أباك") translators should investigate their wider context of use.

As for metaphorical implicatures, translators should be fully conscious of the fact that the translation of metaphor depends mainly on the job the metaphor does in the text i.e. whether it is used creatively or decoratively. So, if the metaphor is creative, a formal equivalence should be called for though it sometimes renders the metaphor less natural to the (TL) readers. We have noticed the rendering of " وطنت النفس على أن تلبس لكل حالة لبوسها" into "She accustomed herself to wearing an attire for every circumstance". If the metaphor is decoratively used, priority should be given to formal over functional equivalence, provided that it sounds natural in the (TL) text and makes sense to (TL) readers. Otherwise, functional equivalence should be called for.

References

1) Aziz, Y., "Translation and Pragmatic Meaning", Shunnaq, A and Others, eds. Issues in Translation, Irbid: Dar Al-Hilal for Translation, (1998), 119-140.
2) Baker, M. "In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation", London, Routledge, (1992).
3) Barbe, K., "Isn't It Ironic That… Explicit Irony Markers", *Journal of Pragmatics* **20**, (1993), 579-590.
4) Broeck, R., "The Limits of Translating Exemplified by Metaphor Translation", *Poetics Today*, **2(4)**: (1981).73-87.
5) Brown, P. and Levinson, S. "Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage", Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1987).
6) Farghal, M. "Colloquial Jordanian Arabic Tautologies", *Journal of Pragmatics*, **17**: (1992), 223-240.
7) Farghal, M. and Al-Borini, A. "Pragmareligious Failure in Translating Arabic Politeness Formulas into English", *Evidence from Mahfouz's Awlad Haritna*. *Multilingua*, **16(1),** (1997), 77-99.

8) Farghal, M. and Al-Shorafat,M. "The Translation of English Passives into Arabic: An Empirical Perspective", *Target*, **8(1)**, (1996), 97-118.

9) Grice, H.P. "*Logic and Conversation*", In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.). "Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts". NewYork: Academic Press. (1975), 41-58.

10) Kotthoff, H. "Responing to Irony in Different Contexts: On Cognition in Conversation", *Journal of Pragmatics*, **35**, (2003), 1387-1411.

11) Leech, G. "The Principles of Pragmatics", London, Longman Group, (1983).

12) Levinson, S. "Pragmatics", Cambridge, University Press, (1983).

13) Mahfouz, N. (1947). "Ziqaq Al-Midaq". Cairo: The Library of Egypt. Translated by Trevor Le Gassick (1975) as "Midaq Alley". London: Heinemann.

14) Mateo, M. "The Translation of Irony", Meta, **40 (1)**, (1995), 171-177.

15) Miki, E. "Evocation and Tautologies" *Journal of Pragmatics*, **25**, (1996), 635-648.

16) Newmark, P. "Approaches to Translation", Oxford, Pergamon Press, (1981).

17) Okamoto, Sh. "*Nominal Repetitive Constructions in Japanese: The "Tautology"* Controversy Revisited, *Journal of Pragmatics*, **20**, (1993), 433-466.

18) Searle, J. "Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts", Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, (1979).

19) Wierzbicka, A. "Boys will be Boys: Radical Semantics vs Radical Pragmatics. Language **63 (1)**, (1987), 95-114.

Appendix

ترجم ما تحته خط إلى الإنجليزية:

١. الرجال أمثالك يستأهلون العذاب، هلا كفيتنا شر الفضائح، هلا كفيتنا ذل الشماتة!
عليه العوض! عليه العوض!

٢. ومن يرضى بالزواج مني؟
فثنت أم حميدة سبابة يسراها ولصقتها بحاجبها وقالت باستنكار:
ألف رجل و رجل

٣. أبدأ المأساة الحقيقية هي أن صديقنا هو عدونا
بل أننا جبناء، لم لا نعترف بهذا ؟
ربما ولكن كيف تتأتى لنا الشجاعة في هذا العصر؟
الشجاعة هي الشجاعة
والموت هو الموت

٤. ولكن الفتاة رمتها بنظرة غاضبة وقالت بحدة:

لست أجري وراء الزواج، ولكنه يجري ورائي أنا، وسأنبذه كثيراً.

طبعاً ! أميرة بنت أمراء !

٥. فقالت الفتاة إمعانا في إغاظتها:

ألا يجوز أن أكون من صلب باشوات ولو عن سبيل الحرام؟!

فهزت المرأة رأسها وقالت ساخرة:

رحم الله أباك بائع الدوم بمرجوش

٦. وهذا عباس الحلو يسترق النظر إلى النافذة في جمال ودلال ولعله لا يشك في أن هذه النظرة سترميني عند قدميه أسيرة لهواه، أدركوني يا هوه قبل التلف!

٧. وانهالت عليه ضرباً، فسقط طربوشه، وسال الدم من أنفه. ثم قبضت على ربطة رقبتيه وشدت عليها بعنف حتى اختنق صوته.

وقد ذهل الجلوس، وحملقوا فيما يقع أمامهم بأعين دهشة، ولكن قلوبهم رقصت جذلاً، ومنوا أنفسهم برؤية منظر بهيج مسل.

٨. ولم تكن مرتاحة للزيارة بطبيعة الحال، لأن زيارة تقوم بها صاحبة الملك أمر قد تسوء عواقبه، وقد ينذر بالخطر. ولكنها

وطنت النفس على أن تلبس لكل حالة لبوسها.